UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,033	12/08/2005	Mutsumi Wakai	053451	8322

38834 7590 11/13/2009

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER	
KASHNIKOW, ERIK	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1794	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/13/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentmail@whda.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,033	WAKAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ERIK KASHNIKOW	1794	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 and 3-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/26/08*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1 and 3-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant does not have support for the range of 2.89 or below. MPEP 2163.05 III states that when submitting new ranges the range must be inherently supported by the original disclosure. In the instant case the original disclosure contained no ranges, and therefore the range of 2.89 or below, which would include an infinite number of possibilities between 2.89 and 0 is not supported in the original specification. It is noted that original specification does have support for hazes of exactly 2.56, 2.72 and 2.89%.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140

F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1 and 7 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of copending Application No. 11/596,678 in view of Ikeda et al. (US 6,214,476). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because while claim 1 does not teach an overcoat layer in light of the open language of the claim1, i.e. comprising, it is clear that claim 1 is open to the inclusion of additional layers, including an overcoat layer as required in 11/596,678. With regards to claim 7 the only difference is the range of linear low density polyethylene. The present claims require 45-5% whereas the copending claims claim 45-10%, which leaves a difference of 5% on the lower end of the scale, however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the amount of linear low density polyethylene disclosed in the copending claim falls completely with in the broad range presently claimed and thus one of ordinary skill in the art would have arrived at the present invention. Further Ikeda et al. teach that petroleum resin acts as a tackifier when mixed in with polyolefin resins (column 6 lines 48-54). Ikeda et al. teach that the tackifier is present in amounts from

50-99% by weight of the olefin (column 4 lines 40-55). As all components of the instant invention are present and with in the ranges claimed, the lateral direction shrinkage of the invention of Ishige, Arjunan and Ikeda would intrinsically be the same. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to add the tackifier because it results in increased adhesion between layers (column 1 lines 7-16).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

5. Claims 1 and 7 directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claim1 and 2 of commonly assigned 11/596,678. Specifically, although the conflicting claims are not identical they are not patentably distinct for the reasons set forth in paragraph 3 above.

6. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP Chapter 2300). Commonly assigned 11/596,678, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon

the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications pending on or after December 10, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim1, 4-10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishige et al. (US 2002/0155277) in view of Arjunan et al. (WO 98/44043) and of Ikeda et al. (US 6,214,476).

9. Ishige et al. teach a mutlilayered stretched resin film with excellent printability that can be used as a label (paragraph 0001).

10. In regards to claims 1 and 7 Ishige et al. teach multi layer films with at least 2 different layers, Layer A, a base layer, which contains 40-90% a polyolefinic resin and 10-60% an organic filler (corresponding to applicants intermediate film layer), and layer B containing 0-85% a polyolefinic resin and 15-100% of an amorphous resin (corresponding to applicants front-back film layers). Ishige et al. also teach an optional surface layer, Layer C (paragraph 0019). In regards to layer A Ishige et al. teach that the polyolefinic resin maybe a polypropylene alpha olefin copolymer resin, and specifically an ethylene propylene random copolymer (paragraph 0023). Ishige et al. further teach that the organic filler can be cyclopolyolefins (paragraph 0027). In regards

to layer B Ishige et al. teach that the polyolefinic resins for layer B follow the same limitations of the polyolefinic resin in layer A (paragraph 0034), which includes polyethylene with densities between 0.89-0.97g/cm3 which encompasses the range of linear low density polyethylene's (LLDPE). Ishige et al. further teach that the amorphous resin is typically exemplified as a cycloolefinic resin (paragraph 0036). Ishige et al. teach that typical film embodiments will have layers sequenced C/B/A/B (paragraph 0060). In regards to the haze as all the materials are the same and present in the concentration ranges claimed, the film must necessarily have the same haze range. It is also noted that haze is defined as the difference between gloss at 60 and 20O, where as opacity is the degree to which a coating will obstruct the surface it has been applied to (http://www.bamr.co.za/appearance.shtml). Examiner points out that an article may be glossy and opaque. Further it is noted that Ishige et al. teach that the film preferably has an opacity of 70% and higher so that a paper like texture is obtained. It is noted that it is obvious to eliminate a step or element and its function (paragraph 0059). As the instant application does not require a paper like texture it would be obvious to lower the opacity since the property on which opacity is depend upon for is not desired (MPEP 2144.04 II A).

11. In regards to claim 8 Ishige et al. teach that another layer sequence for their film can be C/B/A/B/C (paragraph 0079).

12. While Ishige et al. teach the composition and the layer sequence of the film they are silent about specifically using LLDPE.

13. Arjunan et al. teach LLDPE resins which are improved in their ability to be formed into a film layer (page 3 lines 19-20).

14. In regards to claim 1 and 7 Arjunan et al teach that LLDPE is desirable as a resin for films because of its relatively low cost compared to other resin types and its excellent mechanical, physical and chemical properties (page 2 lines 25-30).

15. In regards to claims 4 and 9 Arjunan et al. teach that the LLDPE can be one which is produced with metallocene based catalyst systems (page 6 lines 14-19).

16. In regards to claim 5 and the physical/mechanical properties of claim 1 while Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. are silent regarding the properties claimed by applicant, Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. teach all the materials and limitations of applicant and the physical properties are therefore considered inherent.

17. In regards to claims 6 and 10 Examiner points out that the claims will be treated as product by process claims (MPEP 2113) specifically the portion of the claim that is treated in this manner is "the label being heat shrunk onto the container body". Ishige et al. teach that the films of their invention are useful as labels (paragraph 0001). It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that labels are placed onto containers.

18. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to modify the films of Ishige et al. with that of Arjunan et al. because the films of Ishige et al. which offers improved drying properties and is excellent in printing property (paragraph 0009 and 0010), would benefit from the low cost and excellent mechanical/physical/chemical properties of Arjunan et al. (page 2 25-30).

19. As stated above Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. teach multilayer films that can be used as labels, however they are silent regarding petroleum resins mixed with the random propylene copolymer.

20. Ikeda et al. teach film compositions with enhanced adhesion and gas barrier properties (column 1 lines 7-11).

21. In regards to claims 1 and 7 Ikeda et al. teach that petroleum resin acts as a tackifier when mixed in with polyolefin resins (column 6 lines 48-54). Ikeda et al. teach that the tackifier is present in amounts from 50-99% by weight of the olefin (column 4 lines 40-55). As all components of the instant invention are present and with in the ranges claimed, the lateral direction shrinkage of the invention of Ishige, Arjunan and Ikeda would intrinsically be the same as well as any other mechanical, chemical and physical properties.

22. In regards to claim 13 as the same materials as the instant invention are taught in the same concentrations the shrinkage in the lateral direction would intrinsically be the same when done under the same conditions.

23. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to modify the film of Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. with those of Ikeda et al. because the films of Ikeda et al. because the multilayer films of Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. which have excellent printing properties and low cost would benefit from the external appearance shrinkabillity and adhesion between layers of Ikeda et al (column 1 lines 7-16).

24. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishige et al. (US 2002/0155277) in view of Arjunan et al. (WO 98/44043) and Ikeda et al. (US 6,214,476) in further view of Tanaka et al (US 5,695,838).

25. As stated above Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. teach multilayer films that can be used as labels, however they are silent regarding low crystalline alpha olefin copolymers.

26. Tanaka et al. teach adhesive polypropylene compositions and multilayer articles containing said composition (column 1 lines 8-10).

27. In regards to claim 3 Tanaka et al. teach that a polypropylene resin, including copolymers of polypropylene and other alpha olefin co-monomers is mixed with a modified polyolefin, which is preferably a low crystalline ethylene/alpha olefin copolymer base resin (column 2 lines 1-65).

28. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to modify the film of Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. with those of Tanaka et al. because the films of Ikeda et al. and because the multilayer films of Ishige et al. and Arjunan et al. which have excellent printing properties and low cost would benefit from the excellent adhering force in both the drawn and undrawn state of the films of Tanaka et al. (column 1 lines 45-47).

29. Claims 11, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishige et al. (US 2002/0155277) in view of Arjunan et al. (WO 98/44043) and of Ikeda et al. (US 6,214,476) in further view of Hoffman (US 4,416,714).

30. As stated above Ishige et al. Ikeda et al. and Arjunan et al. teach a heat shrink film used as a label which comprises a cyclic polyolefin and LLDPE that would intrinsically have the same shrinkage in the lateral direction as well as the same mechanical physical and chemical properties, however they are silent regarding forming a tube of the film before and attaching said tube of film as a label.

31. Hoffman teaches methods for attaching heat shrink labels (column 1 lines 15-20).

32. Hoffman teaches that a method for attaching heat shrink labels to containers consists of taking a film and forming a tube wherein the leading edge of the tube overlaps with the trailing edge of the tube, and then heat shrinking the label to the container (column 1 lines 58-64).

33. In regards to claim 14 as the same materials as the instant invention are taught in the same concentrations the shrinkage in the lateral direction would intrinsically be the same when done under the same conditions.

34. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be motivated to modify the invention of Ishige et al. Ikeda et al. and Arjunan et al. with that of Hoffman because the invention of Hoffman offers saves material and energy, and therefore saves money (column 6 lines 60-67).

Response to Arguments

35. Examiner has submitted a copy of the PTO/SB/08 form indicating all references considered.

36. In regards to Applicant's arguments regarding the haze. It is first noted that haze is defined as the difference between gloss at 60 and 20O, where as opacity is the degree to which a coating will obstruct the surface it has been applied to (http://www.bamr.co.za/appearance.shtml). Examiner points out that an article may be glossy and opaque. Further it is noted that Ishige et al. teach that the film preferably has an opacity of 70% and higher so that a paper like texture is obtained. It is noted that it is obvious to eliminate a step or element and its function (paragraph 0059). As the instant application does not require a paper like texture it would be obvious to lower the opacity since the property on which opacity is depend upon for is not desired (MPEP 2144.04 II A). Further, "nonpreferred disclosures can be used. A nonpreferred portion of a reference disclosure is just as significant as the preferred portion in assessing the patentability of claims." In re Nehrenberg, 280 F.2d 161, 126 USPQ 383 (CCPA 1960).

37. It is noted that while Arjunan, Ikeda, Tanaka and Hoffman do not disclose all the features of the present claimed invention, they are used as teaching reference, and therefore, it is not necessary for this secondary reference to contain all the features of the presently claimed invention, *In re Nievelt*, 482 F.2d 965, 179 USPQ 224, 226 (CCPA 1973), *In re Keller* 624 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). Rather this reference teaches a certain concept, and in combination with the primary reference, discloses the presently claimed invention. If the secondary reference contained all the

features of the present claimed invention, it would be identical to the present claimed invention, and there would be no need for secondary references.

Conclusion

38. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erik Kashnikow whose telephone number is (571)270-3475. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00PM EST (Second Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye can be reached on (571) 272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Erik Kashnikow
Examiner
Art Unit 1794

/Rena L. Dye/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794